DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 857 EA 020 657

AUTHOR Webb, L. Dean; And Others
TITLE Overcoming Sex Disequity in Educational Administration: Eliminating Persistent Barriers through the Development of an Instrument for Department Self-Assessment and a Model for Institutional Change.
INSTITUTION University Council for Educational Administration.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-922971-03-X
PUB DATE Sep 86
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affirmative Action; Change Strategies; Educational Administration; Educational Change; *Educational Discrimination; *Equal Education; Feminism; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Sex Bias; *Sex Discrimination; *Womens Education

ABSTRACT

The persistent barriers to women's educational equity in educational administration may be eliminated through this project, which describes the development of an instrument for department self-assessment of sex equity and a model for institutional change. The procedures for developing, testing, and disseminating the instrument for self-assessment of sex equity are provided in detail. A set of standards, grouped by major area of activity, is presented that will ensure that women receive equitable experiences during their graduate studies. Strategies for change are described in the final chapter. Appended are 22 references; a bibliography; interview questions for use in cases of perceived bias or discrimination in departmental conditions, policies, and practices; and a list of University Council for Educational Administration member universities. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303857

OVERCOMING SEX DISEQUITY IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION:

ELIMINATING PERSISTENT BARRIERS THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR DEPARTMENT SELF-ASSESSMENT AND A MODEL FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

September 1986

L. Dean Webb
Project Director

Robert Stout
Project Co-Director

Arlene Metha
Project Associate Director

University Council for Educational Administration
116B Farmer Building
Tempe, Arizona 85287

EA020657

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Nash

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OVERCOMING SEX DISEQUITY

IN

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION:

ELIMINATING PERSISENT BARRIERS THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR DEPARTMENT SELF-ASSESSMENT AND A MODEL FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much appreciation is due to Patrick Forsyth, Executive Director and Kathleen Groth, Administrative Assistant, University Council for Educational Administration for their continuous support and assistance in making this project possible.

Our appreciation also goes to Gladys S. Johnston, Dean of the College of Education at Arizona State University and Raymond Kulhavy, former Acting Dean, for their cooperation and commitment to this project.

The completion of this project would not have been possible without the participation of key individuals at the five cooperating institutions. We wish to thank each of the following individuals for their guidance and cooperation, especially in the field testing of the instrument with their own faculties:

Arizona State University	Robert T. Stout Maria Sanchez Gwen Raab
Georgia State University	James H. Maxey Brenda McAvoy
Indiana University	Martha M. McCarthy Gayle Hall
University of Oregon	Richard A. Schmuck Marlies Kruse
Rutgers University	James R. Bliss Edna Rivers Kim Koritao

We also extend our special thanks to the following individuals who served as select observers and participated in telephone interviews and critiques of the draft instruments:

Judith Atkinson, North Texas State University
Lynn Arney, Oklahoma State University
Jerry D. Bailey, University of Kansas
David G. Carter, University of Connecticut
Grace Butler Chisolm, Texas A & M University
Nancy A. Evers, University of Cincinnati
Yvonna S. Lincoln, University of Kansas
Donald McCarty, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Murial Mackett, Northern Illinois University
Catherine Marshall, Vanderbilt University
Norma Mertz, University of Tennessee
Gail Schneider, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Clayton Thomas, Illinois State University
Deborah Verstagen, University of Texas

Lastly, we wish to express our gratitude to Patti York for her assistance in preparing the final manuscript.

L. Dean Webb
Robert Stout
Arlene Metha

University Council for Educational Admistration
Tempe, Arizona
1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements i

Overview 1

Objectives 5

Procedures 6

1. Selected Five Representatives From UCEA Departments of Educational Administration 6
2. Developed a Draft Instrument for Self-Assessment of Sex Equity 6
3. Conducted a Training Session on the Use and Application of the Instrument and the Development of Strategies for Change and Action Plans 8
4. Field Tested the Draft Instrument and Designed Change Strategies and Action Plans 8
5. Developed Final Instrument for Self-Assessment of Sex Equity 9
6. Developed Model for Institutional Change 9
7. Disseminated the Instrument for Self-Assessment of Sex Equity 9
8. Evaluated 10

Instrument for Self-Assessment of Sex Equity 11

- Recruiting 12
- Admissions 14
- Advising 16
- Program Experiences 18
  - Instructional Materials 18
  - Program Content 19
  - Clinical Experiences 20
  - Supporting Activities 21
  - Program Structure and Policies 22
  - Professionalism 23
- Career Support 24
- Ancillary Support 25

Strategies for Change: Action Plans 26
- Overview 26
- Summary 29

References 30

Appendix A
- Bibliography - Women in Educational Administration 32

Appendix B
- Interview Questions 35

Appendix C
- UCEA Member Universities 37

Excluding women from administration of public schools is legally wrong, morally sinful, and socially stupid.

Pittenger (1976)

OVERVIEW

Despite the passage of legislation calling for the end of sex discrimination and numerous affirmative action efforts, the representation of women in all levels of educational administration remains low, and, over time, has actually decreased. For example, women constituted less than two percent of superintendents in the 1981-82 school year (Jones & Monenegro, 1982) as compared to the nine percent in 1950 (McCarthy, Kuhl, & Beckman, 1979). In 1928, women held 55 percent of all principal positions in elementary schools. By 1984, although 83 percent of all elementary and 43 percent of all secondary teachers were women, the number of women elementary principals had decreased to 18 percent and the number of women secondary principals to 3 percent (Whitaker & Hales, 1984).

The steady decline in the number of women in school administration led to the increased interest of social researchers in the 1970s in explaining this trend. What emerged from their inquiry was the postulation of a set of socio-emotional traits and behaviors that seemed to mitigate against or act as barriers to the full participation of women in administration. Shakeshaft (1980) has classified some of these barriers as internal (personal) barriers. These barriers are generally perceived as deficiencies or inadequacies which exist within women themselves. Sometimes described as limitations inherent in traditional "feminine" traits, internal barriers include: reluctance to take risks, lack of assertiveness, lack of self-confidence or poor self-image, low aspirations and fear of success. Other internal barriers, sometimes seen as the result of previous "traditional" education and differential socialization include lack of experience and training in leadership skills, communication, conflict resolution, and working as a team member. Primary responsibility for family and child care, and role conflict between career and home, are also termed internal barriers to women's achievement in educational administration.

Yet another set of barriers to women's full participation in educational administration are what Shakeshaft (1980) referred to as external (structural/institutional) barriers. Structural/institutional barriers are those that are embedded within the educational experience and revolve around the quality of the educational experience. They are so tightly interwoven into the educational system they cannot be changed without challenging the basic assumptions, attitudes, and belief systems of those directly involved in providing instruction and preparation for educational leadership. Among the structural/institutional barriers which affect the professional socialization of school administrators are organizational norms, values, and mores that subscribe to and accept the male model as the correct and only model for educational administration. Other barriers are: lack of role models, lack of sponsors and sponsorship, lack of financial support, lack of incentives, lack of access to informal interactions, and lack of opportunities for training. The institutional barriers also include degrees of professional support, standards and levels of performance based upon the male ethic in management, and attitudes toward women in leadership positions in educational administration and toward women in general.

An objective reason for the underrepresentation of women in school administration in the past was their lack of preparation and certification in educational administration (Cohen, 1971; Howard, 1980). However, this lack of preparation and certification no longer exists. Whereas in 1953 only 14 percent of women in education held advanced degrees, by 1979 the number had doubled (American Association of School Administrators, 1981). Further evidence of the preparedness of women for positions as school administrators is shown by such data as that which documents the increase in the number of female doctoral students in educational administration training programs. Studies of doctoral students in 1973-74 (Kline & Musterman, 1975) and 1978-79 (McCarthy, Kuh & Beckman, 1979) showed an increase in the percentage of female doctoral students from 12 percent to 29 percent. These increased enrollments of females into doctoral programs in education administration are particularly revealing in light of past history. For example, Maienza (1986) found that in her study of female superintendents, 60 percent reported that they were discouraged from applying to doctoral programs or had been denied admission to doctoral programs in educational administration prior to 1968. Eccles (1986) has postulated that academic course selection, career choice, attributional patterns and expectations for success are all influenced by gender-role stereotyping.

While the efforts and projects directed toward both internal and external barriers have, without question, impacted upon sex equity in education, especially in such areas as research, networking, curriculum, and implementation of non-discriminatory legislation, and the number of women preparing for careers in educational administration has increased, the previously documented problem of sex disequity in educational administration remains. The disequity in educational administration is particularly invidious because of the impact that educational administrators have on the entire climate and process of education.

As Weber, Feldman and Poling (1981), have pointed out, if the underrepresentation of women in educational administration is to be remediated "targets for change" must be identified. Professors of educational administration and departments of educational administration are such "targets". Professors of educational administration are of particular importance in terms of their impact. Professors of educational administration have responsibilities for student recruitment and admissions, placement in administrative positions, and for preservice and inservice programs for principals, superintendents, and other educational administrators. Because of their responsibilities and interactions they are in a unique position in terms of their ability to effect existing conditions in the field as well as the preparation and placement of those who are to be the educational leaders of the future. If women's equity in educational administration is to be advanced, and if sex discrimination is to be diminished or eradicated, professors of educational administraton and departments of educational administration must become <u>proactive</u> leaders in reducing the barriers to women's achievement in educational administration.

A critical event necessary for professors of educational administration to become leaders in the advancement of sex equity is that they internalize, and perhaps even take individual or institutional ownership of the conditions which reflect and promote sex disequity. Thus far the thrust of the efforts to alleviate sex disequity have been primarily "other directed." Institutions and individuals have, by and large, read about or studied examples and situations elsewhere. When self-studies have been conducted, they have tended to be institution-wide or system-wide. This distancing from the department level contributes to department disownership of responsibility for any conditions found to exist. Also exacerbating the condition of disownership is that numbers are discussed in the aggregate (e.g.: Only, X% of the principals nationally are women), rather than the specific (e.g.: Although X% of our graduates are women, only X% of the principals in our area/state are women).

Compounding the lack of ownership of sex disequity and the lack of awareness and sensitivity is the participation patterns in sex equity training efforts. Sex equity training efforts thus far have tended to benefit those least in need of the training -- women and others already committed to sex equity. While it is not the fault of those designing or conducting such training, an examination of the list of attendees at almost any sex-equity conference or workshop where attendance is not either being required or being financially supported, would reveal that the average attendee is not a representative of the traditional white male establishment. Yet, 98 percent of the professors of educational administration, those same professors who are so important to the profession of educational administration, are white males (Lovelady-Dawson, 1981).

The underguiding assumption of this project was that only when professors and departments of educational administration see the problem of sex disequity as one of which they are a part, can change be expected to occur. It was also the assumption of this project that there is a need to actively involve professors and departments of educational administration in activities designed to: (1) identify specific barriers in their own institutions and departments to women's entry and mobility in educational administration; (2) address specific barriers that limit, impede, retard, or prohibit women's access and mobility in educational administration positions; (3) determine appropriate strategies to overcome or remove such barriers; and (4) take leadership in promoting sex equitable practices in the field of educational administration. Research has documented that efforts toward achieving change in organizational systems are most effective when those individuals who are directly responsible for making changes are active agents in the change process (Herriott & Gross, 1979).

Given the above assumptions, it became the goal of this project to engage faculty in five select departments of educatonal administration in the development of an instrument for department self-assessment and a model for institutional change (strategies and action plans). Although self-study guides on sex equity do exist [(e.g., Flagle & Bogart (1981) Accreditation Agency User Handbook for the Institutional Self-study Guide on Sex Equity for Postsecondary Educational Institutions], they do

not address the issues and barriers specific to departments of educational administration. Likewise, although these are excellent examples of self-study guides that relate to compliance with Title IX (e.g., Project Equity's (1980) Title IX Self Study Tool), they too are not content specific to educational administration. Because existing self-study guides are generic, they are less likely to unmask the specific structural/institutional barriers found in departments of educational administration than one developed by those involved in these departments for use by these departments.

The potential impact of the development of such an instrument and the accompanying model is far reaching. They have the potential of providing both the impetus and means for eradicating barriers to women's full participation in educational administration. As professors and departments of educational administration become actively involved in the examination of structural/institutional barriers to women's achievement in educational administration positions, they will become more aware of attitudes, their own and those in their institution, which limit the progress of women. As they research and become familiar with actual data regarding women, their skills, abilities, and performance in educational administration positions, and as they (professors) develop an awareness of the needs and experiences of women aspiring to positions in educational administration, they will develop and support strategies that facilitate the entry, attainment, and mobility of women in educational administration.

The instrument also can be an invaluable tool for aiding the accreditation process by making available to accreditation consultants/evaluators documentation covering the institution's progress in the area of sex equity. Such a guide would be particularly helpful to regional accrediting agencies, such as the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities, as well as such professional accrediting bodies as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

OBJECTIVES

The purposes of this model project were to eliminate persistent barriers to women's educational equity in educational administration through the development of an instrument for department self-assessment of sex equity and a model for institutional change. Specific objectives were for professors and departments of educational administration to:

1. assess the negative influences within departments of educational administration and institutions of higher learning which impede, retard, restrict, or prohibit women's access, achievement, and mobility in educational administration;

2. identify specific barriers to women's educational equity in educational administration within departments of educational administration and institutions of higher learning;

3. become familiar with actual data regarding women, their skills, abilities, and performance in educational administration positions;

4. develop awareness of the needs and experiences of women aspiring to positions in educational administration.

5. become more aware of attitudes with departments of educational administration and institutions of higher learning which limit the progress of women.

6. determine appropriate strategies for removing, eliminating, or reducing specific barriers identified by departments of educational administration.

7. initiate action to implement strategies for removing, eliminating, or reducing barriers.

PROCEDURES

The following procedures were followed:

1. Selected Five Representatives from UCEA Departments of Educational Administration

Institutions were selected as field test sites based on their geographic distribution, membership in the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), and the commitment of the project coordinators to sex equity. Appendix C contains a list of all UCEA member institutions. The following representative institutions were chosen to field test the instrument.

- Arizona State University (Robert T. Stout, Field Test Coordinator)
- Georgia State University (James H. Maxey, Field Test Coordinator)
- Indiana University (Martha M. McCarthy, Field Test Coordinator)
- University of Oregon (Richard A. Schmuck, Field Test Coordinator)
- Rutgers University (James R. Bliss, Field Test Coordinator)

2. Developed a Draft Instrument for Self-Assessment of Sex Equity

The first phase of the project involved the development of a draft instrument for self-assessment of sex equity. A review of existing self-evaluation or self-study guides that aimed at evaluating sex equity was completed. Existing self-study guides, such as the Accreditation Agency User Handbook for the Institutional Self Study Guide on Sex Equity for Postsecondary Educational Institutions by Flagle & Bogart (1981) and the Title IX Self-Study Tool developed by Project Equity (1980) served as a resource in developing the categories and items for the instrument. The categories and items were content specific to departments of educational administration. The following methods or procedures were used to design the categories and construct the items:

A. Literature Review. The literature review encompassed:

- recently published journals, monographs, and books on the topic of women in educational administration. An abbreviated bibliography resulting from this review is presented in Appendix A.

B. Legal Precedent Review. This review encompassed:

- select court cases filed under Executive Order 11375, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

- select amicus briefs, amicus curiae, and consent decrees.

C. Interviews with Select Observers. Telephone or personal interviews were conducted with select observers presumed to be knowledgeable of departments of educational administration. These observers included department chairs, deans, faculty, and graduate students of member UCEA Departments of Educational Administration. Prior to the telephone interview, a letter was sent to observers requesting their participation in the interview process. During the interview, the respondents were asked to describe in detail any of conditions, policies, and practices which affect educational equity and serve as barriers to women's access, achievement, and mobility in educational administration. (A copy of the interview questions is found in Appendix B.)

The select observers included the following distinguished members of the field of educational administration:

Judith Adkinson, North Texas State University

Lynn Arney, Oklahoma State University

Jerry D. Bailey, University of Kansas

David G. Carter, University of Connecticut

Grace Butler Chisolm, Texas A & M University

Nancy A. Evers, University of Cincinnati

Yvonna S. Lincoln, University of Kansas

Donald McCarty, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Murial Mackett, Northern Illinois University

Catherine Marshall, Vanderbilt University

Norma Mertz, University of Tennessee

Gail Schneider, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Clayton Thomas, Illinois State University

Deborah Verstagen, University of Texas

D. Following the telephone interviews with the above representatives of the field of educational administration, the interview comments were transcribed, coded and placed in categories, headings, and themes. These initial categories included such themes as admissions, educational programs, support services, student access to faculty, administration, and staff, etc. and served as the basis for the design of the instrument.

E. Control for Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

As Isaac and Michael (1982) explain, "face validity" is often used to indicate whether the instrument on the face of it, appears to measure what it claims to measure. A panel of experts in equity issues were asked to review and critique the instrument to determine its face validity. Their comments assisted in revising the draft instrument. The panel of experts included the select observers who were interviewed by telephone, plus additional educational administrators and sex equity specialists. Each was sent the draft of the instrument and asked to critique each item. Several helpful suggestions were made and revisions were made of the initial draft.

The reliability of the instrument was addressed by having participants at the training session (see below) code hypothetical responses to each item. An intercoder reliability index was then calculated for each item. Krippendorff (1980) explains that the major aim of instrument reliability is to establish whether data obtained can provide a trustworthy basis for drawing inferences, making recommendations, supporting decisions or accepting the results as fact.

3. Conducted a Training Session On the Use and Application of the Instrument and the Development of Strategies for Change and Action Plans

On December 3-4, 1985, coordinators from the selected UCEA Departments of Educational Administration participated in a training session at Arizona State University designed to acquaint them with the draft instrument for self-assessment of sex equity. The draft was subjected to an intensive critique and suggestions for revision were made. In addition, the coordinators were introduced to the concept of designing change strategies and developing action plans to improve equity (e.g., California Coalition for Sex Equity in Education, 1978).

Following the training session project staff revised the instrument based on the suggestions of the field test coordinators.

4. Field Tested the Draft Instrument for Self-Assessment of Sex Equity and Designed Change Strategies and Action Plans

During January-May, 1986 the five UCEA Departments of Educational Administration participated in a field test of the draft instrument for self-assessment of sex equity. Each department conducted a self-analysis using the draft instrument. Upon completion of the self-assessment, and based upon its findings, departments were asked to design specific change strategies and action plans to alleviate identified barriers and increase sex equity.

5. Developed Final Instrument for Self-Assessment of Sex Equity

On June 8-10, 1986 the field test coordinators from the five UCEA Departments of Educational Administration met at Arizona State University for a debriefing session. Case studies were presented. The discussions which followed resulted in further revision of the instrument for self-assessment of sex equity. Change strategies and action plans from each field site were also discussed. As a result of these discussions, individual strategies and plans were modified.

During June and July, 1986 the results of the department self-analyses were subjected to item and content analysis. Final revisions were made as appropriate and necessary.

6. Developed Model for Institutional Change

During September 15-19, 1986 the coordinators of the five UCEA Departments of Educational Administration were interviewed by telephone as a final check concerning which change strategies were most effective. As a result of these interviews and the earlier drafts of change strategies and action plans, a model for institutional change was developed.

7. Disseminated the Instrument for Self-Assessment of Sex Equity

The dissemination of the final version of the Instrument for Self-Assessment of Sex Equity in Departments of Educational Administration will be a joint effort of UCEA and the participating departments of educational administration. UCEA specifically commits to publication in the UCEA Monograph Series, the UCEA Review (published four times annually and distributed to some 6,000 university faculty, graduate students, school district leaders, and others) and in at least one of UCEA's two leading journals in the field of educational administration, the Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership and the Educational Administration Quarterly. UCEA also maintains a mailing list of all professors of educational administration in the United States that can provide an important means for disseminating of information to professors in member and non-member institutions about the results of the project. Additional departments and professors of educational administration participating in the project will disseminate self-assessment results through a variety of mediums, such as: published reports, colloquia/symposia, published articles, presentations at conferences, and class materials. The instrument will also be made available to a variety of regional accreditation agencies.

At this writing articles about the project have appeared in the UCEA Review and in local newspapers, presentations have been made before the UCEA Executive Committee and Plenary Session, and proposals have been submitted for presentations at several conferences (acceptance has been received by the American Educational Research Association). Copies of the instrument have been disseminated to all UCEA institutions and to all deans of colleges or universities with departments of educational administration.

8. Evaluated

There were several components to the evaluation of this project. They included:

a. an evaluation of the field test process

During field testing, members of the project staff assumed the role of absentee monitor in order to assess progress. They made frequent telephone calls to the five institutional coordinators, answering questions and inquiring into participation. At the end of the field testing the project staff conducted an assessment of the self-analysis, with the purpose of estimating the degree to which the effort was carried out with its original intent.

b. an evaluation of the self-studies, change strategies, and action plans to determine:

1) the extent to which professors of educational administration were involved in the process;
2) the extent to which the participating departments developed specific strategies for removing, eliminating, or reducing barriers to women's full participation in educational administration;
3) the extent to which the participating departments developed an action plan to address those conditions, policies, and practices that affect educational equity and serve as institutional/structural barriers to women's access, achievement, and mobility in educational administration.

c. the extent to which the instrument is utilized by other departments of educational administration.

This longitudinal evaluation effort will be determined in part by UCEA tracking of requests for the instrument. A survey of UCEA institutions will be conducted one year after its dissemination to them (at the Plenary Session Meeting of October 1986 or by mail if not in attendance at this meeting) to determine if any have utilized the instrument in any way.

d. the number of presentations and publications resulting from the project.

INSTRUMENT FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT OF SEX EQUITY

What follows is a set of standards which, when met by departments of educational administration, will do much to ensure that women receive equitable experiences during their graduate studies. The standards are grouped by major areas of activity. Most can be met by departments alone, although some have clear implications for college or university responsibility. Following each standard are "least effort" ways in which department faculty could gather information about the extent to which the department meets the standard.

RECRUITING

1. Department representatives make visits to school districts, sponsor seminars or workshops or make presentations at professional meetings with the express purpose of recruiting female applicants to the program.

   Data Source: The department chair will have information.

2. Department leadership will have a list of female school administrators in the state or region who are asked routinely to nominate female applicants.

   Data Source: The department chair will have information.

3. Department representatives contact women educator groups/networks/causcuses for nominations of potential women applicants.

   Data Source: The department chair will have information.

4. The department places advertisements in national/regional/state newsletters and professional journals with the express purpose of recruiting female applicants.

   Data Source: The department chair will have information.

5. Faculty and students have specified responsibilities for recruiting women candidates for admission.

   Data Source:

   A. The department chair will have information.

   B. When asked, individual faculty will be able to state responsibilities in this area.

   C. When asked, current students will be able to state their responsibilities in this area.

6. Potential female applicants who are nominated or who self-nominate for admission receive prompt and encouraging follow up materials or contacts.

   Data Source:

   A. A review of follow up procedures can be made by department faculty.

   B. When asked, a sample of female graduate students will give favorable remarks to their treatment as applicants.

8. Special concerns of female applicants (for example, leaves for maternity or child care, timidity about career possibilities, lack of family encouragement for graduate study) are acknowledged where appropriate and treated with sensitivity.

    Data Source: When asked, a sample of graduate students will give favorable marks to the ways in which any of their special concerns were handled.

9. Faculty review the performance of beginning graduate students to identify and encourage able females to continue with more advanced study.

    Data Source: The department chair will have information.

10. Female applicants for admission are persuaded that the department actively supports the entry of women into administrative careers in education.

    Data Source: When asked, female graduate students will declare that they felt their ambitions were encouraged and supported by the department from the time they made initial inquiry.

11. The department has a reputation as an attractive place for women aspirants to learn to become school administrators.

    Data Source:

    A. When asked, female graduate students will give high marks to the department.

    B. When asked, informed educators in the state/region will declare that the department has a good reputation in this area.

ADMISSIONS

1. Department admissions committees have female members (faculty or students).

   Data Source: The department chair will have information.

2. Admission materials do not contain requests for information about matters of life style which are irrelevant to program success (marital status, age, number of children, etc.)

   Data Source:

   A. Application materials can be reviewed by faculty.

   B. Application materials can be reviewed by a university or college affirmative action officer.

3. Requests for information about candidates (letters of reference and the like) are directly linked to criteria known to be associated with student success in the program.

   Data Source:

   A. Application materials can be reviewed by faculty.

   B. Application materials can be reviewed by a university/college affirmative action officer.

4. Application materials encourage candidates to present a wide range of evidence of leadership potential (for example, community leadership as well as leadership in school settings).

   Data Source: Application materials can be reviewed by faculty.

5. Procedures and processes exist to treat equitably females who may present non-traditional credentials for admission (for example, public service in lieu of employment or teacher leadership in lieu of administrative experience).

   Data Source: The department chair will have information.

6. If an interview is required as part of the admission process, steps are taken to insure the absence of bias in the process.

   Data Source:

   A. The department chair will have information.

   B. When asked, a sample of female applicants will attest to the absence of bias in the interview.

7. The department keeps an annual record of the gender of applicants and admitted students and reviews the credentials of women and men in each category for indications of possible sex bias.

   Data Source: The department chair will have information.

8. The department has an official affirmative action plan which include numerical goals and timetables concerning graduate students.

   Data Source:

   A. The department chair will have information.

   B. The college dean will have information.

   C. The affirmative action officer will have information.

ADVISING

1. Within the definitions of high academic standards, students have freedom of choice in establishing and changing program advisory committees or program advisors.

   Data Source:

   A. The faculty can review processes and procedures.

   B. When asked, a sample of female graduate students will attest to the degree of freedom of choice.

2. Procedures exist that match the intellectual and career interests of female students with advisors who are competent and committed to support those interests.

   Data Source:

   A. The faculty can review procedures for making and changing advisor assignments.

   B. When asked, a sample of female graduate students will affirm that their assigned advisors are well matched to their interests.

3. Procedures exist to insure an equitable distribution of male and female advisees to male and female faculty.

   Data Source: A review of advisee assignments to faculty will show no evidence of sex bias.

4. Faculty are competent to advise female graduate students who have special needs or concerns (for example, older or returning students, or females with especially complex family relationships).

   Data Source: When asked, a sample of female graduate students will indicate that their advisors have treated their concerns with sensitivity and thoughtfulness.

5. Programs of study and program experiences of female graduate students prepare them to be competitive for top level career opportunities.

   Data Source:

   A. A comparison of a sample of male and female programs of study will show similar patterns of courses and other experiences.

   B. When asked, a sample of female graduate students will declare that they belive that they are being given good preparation for top level careers.

C. A panel of successful women administrators, after reviewing "typical" programs and experiences of female graduate students will declare that the students are being given good preparation for top level careers.

6. Female graduate students routinely are provided counseling and encouragement to aspire to higher levels of preparation and administrative positions.

Data Source:

A. The department chair will have information about department procedures.

B. When asked, a sample of female graduate students will assert that they have been encouraged to have high aspirations.

7. Female graduate students are enrolled proportionally in courses and degree programs which lead to higher level administrative positions.

Data Source: The following table can be completed and reviewed by faculty to insure the absence of sex bias.

In the last three year period how many students have received:

	Male	Female
M.A.		
M.Ed.		
Ed.S.		
Ed.D.		
Ph.D.		
Certificates (list)		
1.		
2.		

PROGRAM EXPERIENCES

Instructional Materials

1. Instructional materials (textbooks, reading assignments, lectures, audio visual materials) used in the department are free from sex bias in language and content.

   Data Source:

   A. Faculty can review the materials.

   B. A group of female graduate students can review the materials.

2. Instructional materials used in the department represent the scholarship of both women and men in the field.

   Data Source:

   A. Faculty can review the materials.

   B. A group of female graduate students can review the materials.

3. Students (both female and male) are encouraged to pursue research topics which have as a primary focus women in school administration.

   Data Source: The table below can be completed and reviewed by faculty.

Number of Theses and Dissertations
Completed in Last Three Years
Which Have Focused on Women's
Issues or Sex Equity Issues in Education.

	Written by Male Student	Written by Female Student
Directed by Male Faculty:		
Master's Thesis		
Sixth Year Paper		
Doctoral Dissertation		
Directed by Female Faculty:		
Master's Thesis		
Sixth Year Paper		
Doctoral Dissertation		

Program Content

4. Content about women in administration is included routinely in courses.

   Data Source:

   A. When asked, faculty can give examples of such content in the courses they teach.

   B. When asked, a sample of female graduate students will respond that such content is used routinely.

5. Both female and male students learn about sex equity issues and learn how to deal with them in educational organizations.

   Data Source:

   A. Faculty can review how such content is presented.

   B. When asked, a sample of graduate students will assest that they have been prepared in this area.

Clinical Experiences

6. Internships, field work and other clinical experiences are designed to match the aspirations and career ambitions of female students.

   Data Source:

   A. Faculty can review the "match" between assignments and ambitions of a sample of female graduate students.

   B. When asked, a sample of female graduate students will declare a good match between their clinical experiences and their ambitions.

7. Female graduate students are provided with clinical experiences which give them good opportunities to develop higher level administrative skills.

   Data Source: Faculty can review a sample of clinical experiences and assess the degree to which the experiences provide rich opportunities.

8. Clinical experiences are used to raise the career ambitions of female graduate students.

   Data Source: Faculty can review a sample of clinical experiences to assess the degree to which they had potential for raising career ambitions.

9. If paid internships are available they are provided for female graduate students on a proportionate basis.

   Data Source: The table below can be reviewed by faculty for sex bias.

Paid Internship	Gender of Intern		Department Recommendation Paramount	
	Male	Female	Yes	No

Supporting Activities

10. Female graduate students receive on a proportionate basis honors, awards and prizes given by the department, college or university upon department recommendation.

    Data Source: Examine a three year history of such awards, noting the gender of each recipient.

11. Female graduate students receive a proportionate share of fellowships, scholarships and paid assistantships.

    Data Source: The table below, based on the most recent three year time period can be reviewed for sex bias.

	Fellowships		Scholarships		Assistantships		Department Recommendation Paramount	
	#	$	#	$	#	$	Yes	No
Male								
Female								

12. Female graduate students are as involved as male students in assisting faculty in conducting field studies (for example, surveys, work with study councils, pro bono consulting).

    Data Source: Faculty can review a three year history of such involvement by female and male students.

13. Support groups exist in the department for female graduate students.

    Data Source: The department chair will have information.

14. The informal interaction patterns among faculty and students are open, supportive and free from gender-based constraints.

    Data Source:

    A. Faculty can review and assess the nature of informal interaction patterns.

    B. When asked, a sample of female graduate students will give high marks to the informal interaction patterns.

15. A good climate exists for mentoring female graduate students.

    Data Source:

    A. A three year history of co-authorship by female graduate students and faculty.

    B. A three year history for department support for conference/professional meeting attendance by doctoral students.

    C. When asked, a sample of female graduate students will give high marks to the mentoring they received.

Program Structure and Policies

16. The department, college and university have a well-defined and well-publicized policy (including clear procedures) for responding to student grievances about grades on other academic concerns.

    Data Source: The department chair will have information.

17. The department, college and university have a well-defined and well-publicized policy (including clear procedures) for responding to student complaints about sexual harrassment and sex discrimination.

    Data Source: The department chair will have information.

18. The department insures that female graduate students are members of any department/college/university committees which have student representation.

    Data Source: The department chair will have information.

19. The department has provisions to recognize and accommodate delays in program completion necessitated by childbirth or childrearing responsibilities of students.

    Data Source: The department chair will have information.

20. Female and male graduate students have similar patterns of years elapsing between entry into and completion of degrees or certificates.

    Data Source: A sample of graduates during the last three years can be examined to detect any significant differences in years to completion for female and male students.

21. Instructors do not disparage female graduate students in classes or in other arenas by exhibiting behaviors such as scoffing at their intellectual abilities, diverting discussions of the work of females toward discussion of their physical attributes or appearances, relying on sexist humor and the like.

    Data Source: When asked, a sample of female graduate students will report the absence of such behaviors.

22. If students are asked to evaluate their experiences in courses, an opportunity is provided to indicate sexist behavior by the instructor.

    Data Source: The department chiar will have information.

Professionalism

23. Public and private references to female faculty by male faculty are such that perceptions by graduate students of the professional statuses of female faculty are enhanced.

    Data Source: When asked, a sample of graduate students will confirm the professional statuses of female faculty.

24. Female school administrators act as adjunct faculty in the department, if the department employs adjunct faculty.

    Data Source: The department chair will have information about the mix of female and male adjunct faculty.

25. Females are represented equitably in tenure-track faculty positions.

    Data Source:

    A. For the past 10 years hiring and promotion patterns can be examined to detect sex bias.

    B. An examination of the distribution of faculty by gender and by rank can be made to detect sex bias.

26. Female graduate students are provided ample opportunity to interact with successful female school administrators.

    Data Source: A group of female graduate students can be asked to assess available opportunities.

27. Department faculty, through publications, presentations and in other public ways, support issues of sex equity.

    Data Source: Department faculty can record and assess activity for the last three years.

CAREER SUPPORT

1. The placement files of graduates are examined to insure that letters of reference are free of inappropriate refernces to gender characteristics and contain only materials which relate directly to probable job performance.

   Data Source: University placement officials can be contacted to ascertain policies and procedures.

2. Female graduate students are provided training for job interviewing, with special attention being paid to handling incidents of sex bias.

   Data Source: The Department Chair will have information.

3. The department has systems for active tracking of and support for the professional careers of all graduates.

   Data Source:

   A. The Department Chair will have information.

   B. When asked, faculty members will be able to describe efforts to track and support.

   C. When asked, graduates will affirm that they have experienced career support from faculty.

4. Women and men graduates have similar rates of career mobility in the time period soon after program completion.

   Data Source: A study of a sample of career mobility patterns of recent graduates will reveal comparative rates.

5. The department sponsors or supports networks of female administrators.

   Data Source: The Department Chair will have information.

6. Women graduate students have opportunities to interact informally with influential educators in the region.

   Data Source:

   A. The Department Chair will have information.

   B. When asked, a sample of graduate students will recount the extent of their opportunities for such interaction.

ANCILLARY SUPPORT

1. The institution provides facilities and programs of child care for graduate students.

   Data Source: The Department Chair will have information.

2. The institution has procedures for insuring the safety of women graduate students.

   Data Source: The Department Chair will have information.

3. The institution provides a full range of services to women graduate students who experience stress or tension as a result of multiple responsibilities or financial difficulties.

   Data Source: The Department Chair will have information.

4. The department has procedures to insure that women graduate students are made aware of institutional resources available to meet special needs.

   Data Source:

   A. The Department Chair will have information.

   B. When asked, women graduate students will describe their degrees of awareness of such services.

STRATEGIES FOR CHANGE; ACTION PLANS

Overview

Equal opportunity for women in the field of educational administration will not be effectively achieved until institutions recognize the organizational, interpersonal, and intrapersonal barriers to change that exist at a variety of levels (Gery, 1977). Shakeshaft (1985) suggests that strategies for change, whether implemented or imagined, will vary depending upon how the barriers are viewed. Thus, internal barriers will require one type of approach while the external or institutional barriers will require another. Table I describes ten of the most commonly used strategies for change (Landers, Manon, Metha, and Peterson, 1978).

Table I
Strategies for Change

1. AWARENESS	An activity that improves knowledge, sensitivity and understanding.
2. DIAGNOSIS	An assessment activity which ascertains needs, level of commitment or degree of compliance.
3. TRAINING/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	The process of providing information and remedial or preventative strategies to specific groups or identified clients to assist them with the implementation of legal mandates.
4. CONSULTATION	A process which focuses on the skills of group acceptance of the problem, keeping the group on task, encouraging concreteness and specificity from the group, and gaining consensus from the group regarding problem solutions.
5. TEAM BUILDING	A process for identifying team members, building group compatibility, developing group strengths, and delineating team roles.
6. MATERIALS SELECTION	A process for development, adaptation or selection of materials (print and non-print) that are non-sexist.
7. DIRECTIVE CHANGE OR CONFRONTATION	The use or reference to the law as the primary rationale for implementing change.
8. INTERVENTION	Any legislative/executive/judicial action which results in the development of new policies or laws at any level of government.
9. RESOURCE LINKAGE OR THE NETWORKING PROCESS	A plan that ties together any resources (print, non-print, and human resources) through the processes of face-to-face interaction and other kinds of communication networks.
10. COMBINATIONS OF THE ABOVE	

Landers, B., Manon, L., Metha, A. & Peterson, B. (1978). Effective Title IX Strategies: K-Postsecondary. Sacramento, California: The California Coalition for Sex Equity in Education, p. 18.

Table II provides some applications of the strategies presented in Table I as initiated by the five participating departments of educational administration. These applications were directed toward overcoming both personal and institutional barriers to sex equity.

TABLE II

Applications of Strategies for Overcoming Barriers to Sex Equity in Educational Administration

Barrier(s)	Strategy	Application
Sex bias in the classroom	Increase Awareness	Provide students an opportunity to indicate sexist behavior behavior by the instructor on course evaluations.
General issues of sex bias and sex discrimination	Diagnose	Conduct a department self assessment of sex equity. Update on a regular basis to determine progress and change.
Sexual harrassment and sex discrimination	Training/Technical Assistance	Invite the Affirmative Action Action Officer or other institutional representative charged with the responsibility for enforcing of sexual harassment policies to meet with members of the Department Personnel Committee to increase their awareness of this problem on campus.
General sex equity concerns	Consultation	As a department or unit identify a singular sex equity cocern and attempt to gain consensus from the group regarding a problem solution.
Lack of sponsorship	Team Building	Identify faculty members who have been particularly successful in mentoring graduate students, especially females (i.e. joint authorships, joint paper presentations, etc.). Reward such activities on merit reviews.
Sex role stereotyping in curricular materials	Materials Selection	Include awareness and training materials concerning the underemployment of women in educational administration in at least one introductory administration course.

TABLE II (continued)

Applications of Strategies for Overcoming Barriers to Sex Equity in Educational Administration

Barrier(s)	Strategy	Application
Underemployment of women administrators	Directive Change or Confrontation	Require that all students master competency concerning affirmative action programs, antidiscrimination laws, and current litigation regarding sex discrimination in educational administration.
Sex bias in the classroom	Intervention	Issue a policy statement which makes clear that overtly biased comments, use of sexist humor, and related behavior on the part of faculty are not appro- priate in the classroom or in related learning situations.
Lack of support, encouragement, counseling	Resource Linkage or the Networking Process	Provide formal and informal activities networking female students with practicing women administrators.

Summary

Managing any form of social change is a complex process that demands continuous assessment and evaluation. There is no simple recipe for achieving sex equity through social change. However, over the past decade numerous individuals and organizations have utilized and advanced various change models to attain sex equity. While there are numerous interpersonal barriers that exist within women themselves that must be recognized and addressed if permanent change is to occur, it is the institutional barriers that emanate from social conditioning, past organizational reward systems (or negative reinforcement systems) and limited support systems that are the greatest challenge to overcome (Gery, 1977). Colleges or Schools of Education, and in particular departments of educational administration, have not been immune to such barriers. The task of eliminating these barriers may appear awesome but the end result far exceeds the investment or price. We can't afford to not pay the price of change now!

REFERENCES

American Association of School Administrators. (April 1981). Project Aware Newsletter. American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, VA.

Cohen, A. C., (1971). Women and higher education: Recommendations for change. Phi Delta Kappan, 53, 164-67.

Eccles, J. S. (1986). Gender-roles and woman's achievement. Educational Researcher, 15(6), 15-19.

Flagle, J., & Bogart, K. (1981). Accreditation agency user handbook for the institutional self study guide on sex equity for Postsecondary Educational Institutions. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Gery, G. J. (1977). Equal opportunity - planning and managing the process of change. Personnel Journal, 56(4), 184-191, 203.

Howard, S. (1980). Fact sheet on women in educational administration. (Available from author, 402 Tennessee Ave., Alexandria, VA 22305).

Herriott, R., & Gross, N. (1979). The dynamics of planned educational change. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishers.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1982). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego, CA: Edits Publishers.

Jones, E. H. & Montenegro, X. P. (1983). Factors predicting women's upward career mobility in school administration. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 3, 231-242.

Kline, C. E., & Musterman, R. E. (January, 1975). Doctoral students' characteristics: UCEA student data system, 1973-74. UCEA Review, pp. 21-26.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Landers, B., Mahon, L., Metha, A., & Peterson, B. (1978). Effective Title IX strategies: K-postsecondary. Sacramento, CA: The California Coalition for Sex Equity in Education.

Lovelady-Dawson, F. (1981). Women and minorities in education: No room at the top. Principal, 61(1), 37-41.

Maienza, J. G. (1986). The female superintendent: Another perspective. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 49(3), 30-36.

Marshall, C. (1981). Organizational policy and women's socialization in administration. Urban Education, 16, 205-231.

McCarthy, M. M., Kuh, G. D., & Beckman, J. M. (1979). Characteristics and attitudes of doctoral students in educational administration. Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 200-203.

Pittenger, J. (1976). American Association of School Administrators Convention Reporter, Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 9.

Project Equity. (1980). Title IX self-study tool. Fullerton, CA: Sex Desegregation Assistance Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Shakeshaft, C. S. (1980). Dissertation research on women in educational administration: A synthesis of findings and paradigm for future research. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 6455-A. (University Microfilms No. 80-11, 994).

Shakeshaft, C. S. (1985). Strategies for overcoming the barriers to women in educational administration. In Klein, S. (Ed.). Handbook for achieving sex equity through education. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 124-144.

Weber, M. B., Feldman, J. R., & Poling, E. C. (1981). Why women are under- represented in educational administration. Educational Leadership, 40, 320-322.

Whitaker, C. & Hales, W. (1984). Women in administration. Paper presented at the 68th annual meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, February, 1984, Las Vegas, Nevada.

APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Women in Educational Administration

Adkison, J. A. (1981). Women in school administration: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 51(3), 311-343.

Adkison, J. A. & Bailey, J. D. (1981). Increasing women's participation in educational administration. The Education Digest, 46(6), 10-13.

Bogart, K. (1984). Towards equity in academe: An action manual. Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of women, Association of American Colleges.

Clements, J. (1980). Sex bias in school administration. In Biklen, S. K. and Brannigan, M. B. (eds.). Women and educational leadership. Massachusetts: Lexington Brooks.

Crowfoot, J. F., Bryant, B. I. and Chester, M. (1982). Action for Educational Equity. Boston, Massachuseets: Institute for Responsive Education.

Fansher, T. A., & Buxton, T. H. (1984). A job satisfaction profile of the female secondary school principal in the United States. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 68( ), 32-39.

Fisher-Thompson, J. (1981). An overview of re-entry women: Meeting the enrollment challenge. Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Frasher, J. M., & Frasher, R. S. (1980). Sex bias in the evaluation of administrators. The Journal of Educational Administration, 18, 245-253.

Frasher, R. S., Frasher, J. M., & Hardwick, K. (1982). The female superintendent. Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 46(1), 36-42.

Fritsche, J. M. (1985). Toward excellence & equity. Orno, Maine: University of Maine.

Hall, R. & Gleaves, F. (1981). Re-entry women: Special programs for special populations. Washington, DC: Project on the Status and education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Jones, E. H., & Montenegro, X. P. (1982). Recent trends in the representation of women and minorities in school administration and problems in documentation. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Klein, S. & Bogart, K. (1986). Implications for increasing sex equity at all educational levels. Educational Researcher, 15(6), 20-21.

Konek, C. W., Kitch, S. L., Hammond, G. E. (1980). Design for equity: Women and leadership in higher education. Wichita, Kansas: Wichita State University.

Lovelady-Dawson, F. (1980). Women and minorities in the principalship: Career opportunities and problems. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 64(440), 18-29.

Maienza, J. G. (1986). The superintendency: Characteristics for men and women. Educational Administration Quarterly. In press.

McCarthy, M. & Zent, A. (1982). School administrators: A profile. The Education Digest, 47(7), 28-31.

McDade, T. & Drake, J. M. (1982). Career path models for women superintendents. Journal of Educational Research, 75(4), 210-217.

Metzger, C. (1985). Helping women prepare for principalships. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(4), 292-296.

Moore, K. M. & Sagaria, M. A. (1981). Women administrators and mobility: The second struggle. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 44, 21-28.

Nagle, L., Gardner, D. W., Levine, M. & Wolf, S. (1982, March). Sexist bias in instructional supervision textbooks. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Ortiz, F. I. (1982). Career patterns in education: Women, men, and minorities in public school administration. New York: Praeger.

Paddock, S. C. (1980). Women principals: The rule or the exception? National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 64(440), 1-13.

Paddock, S. C. (1981). Male and female career paths in school administration. In P. A. Schmuck, W. W. Charters, Jr., & R. O. Carlson (eds.), Educational policy and management: Sex differentials. New York: Academic Press.

Parker, B. (1984). Nonsexist curriculum development: Theory into practices. Boulder: University of Colorado.

Peters, J. (1980). The quest of the new woman in public school education: 1980. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 14-28.

Rosser, P. (1980). Women fight "old boys" for school administrator jobs. Learning, 7(23), 31-34.

Schmuck, P. A. (1980). Differentiation by sex in educational professions. In J. Stockard, P. A. Schmuck, P. Williams, K. Kempner, S. Edson, & M. A. Smith. Sex equity in education. New York: Academic Press.

Shakeshaft, C. (1985). Strategies for overcoming the barriers to women in educational administration. In Klein, S. (ed.). Handbook for achieving sex equity through education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Shakeshaft, C. (1986). A gender at risk. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(7), 499-503.

Shakeshaft, C. (1986). Women in educational administration. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Shapiro, C. (1984). We'll sue your school board to win equity for women administrators. American School Board Journal, 171 (5), 43-45, 47.

Smith, M. A., Kalvelage, J., Schmuck, P. A. (1982). Sex equity in educational leadership: Women getting together and getting ahead. Portland, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Stockard, J. (1984). Career patterns of high-level women school administrators. Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 48(1), 36-44.

Stockard, J. & Kempner, K. (1981). Women's representation in school administration: Recent trends. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(2), 81-91.

Tetrealt, M. K., Schmuck, P. (1985). Equity, educational reform and gender. Issues in Education, 3(1), 45-67.

Tibbetts, S. L. (1980). Women principals: Superior to the male? Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 43, 15-18.

Tittle, C. K. (1985). Research on sex equity in education: An agenda for the divisions, SIGs, and AERA. Educational Researcher, 14(9), 10-18.

Tracy, S. J. (1985). Career patterns and aspirations of elementary school principals: The gender difference. Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 49(1), 23-28.

Weber, M. B., Feldman, J. R. & Poling, E. C. (1981). Why women are underrepresented in educational administration. Educational Leadership, 38(4), 320-322.

APPENDIX B

Interview Questions

EXAMPLES OF PERCEIVED BIAS OR DISCRIMINATION IN DEPARTMENTAL CONDITIONS, POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Name _____

Institution _____

Student Access to Higher Education (i.e. Admissions, financial aid, etc.)

Educational Programs (i.e. curriculum, materials, etc.)

Support Services and Facilities for Students:

Access to Faculty, Administrators, and Staff:

Networking/Mentoring:

Subtle Inequities:

Discrimination:

Sexual Harrassment:

Dissent, Mediation,
and Grievance Procedures:

Students and Faculty
Knowledge of the
Laws and Regulations
Concerning Sex Equity:

Other Perceived
Areas of Concern:

APPENDIX C

UCEA MEMBER UNIVERSITIES
1984-85

University of Alberta
Arizona State University
University of Arkansas
Boston University
University of Cincinnati
University of Connecticut
University of Florida
Fordham University
Georgia State University
University of Houston
University of Illinois
Northern Illinois University
Illinois State University
Indiana University
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
Kansas State University
University of Kentucky
Louisiana State University
University of Maryland
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
New Mexico State University
New York University
State University of New York at Buffalo
The Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
Oklahoma State University
University of Oregon
The Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rochester
Rutgers University
St. John's University
Temple University
University of Tennessee
University of Texas
Texas A & M University
University of Toledo
University of Utah
University of Virginia
Washington State University
Wayne State University
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

ISBN: 0-922971-03-X